arXiv:1108.5232v3 [math.RT] 14 May 2012

COXETER GROUPS, IMAGINARY CONES AND DOMINANCE

FU, XIANG

School of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

`xifu9119@mail.usyd.edu.au`
`X.Fu@maths.usyd.edu.au`

Preliminary version, May 15, 2012

Abstract. Brink and Howlett have introduced a partial ordering, called *dominance*, on the root systems of Coxeter groups in their proof that all finitely generated Coxeter groups are automatic (Math. Ann. **296** (1993), 179–190). Recently a function called ∞-*height* is defined on the reflections of Coxeter groups in an investigation of various regularity properties of Coxeter groups (Edgar, *Dominance and regularity in Coxeter groups*, PhD thesis, 2009). In this paper, we show that these two concepts are closely related to each other. We also give applications of dominance to the study of *imaginary cones* of Coxeter groups.

1. Background Material

Definition 1.1. (Krammer [20]) Suppose that V is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ and let $(\ ,\ )$ be a bilinear form on V and let Π be a subset of V. Then Π is called a *root basis* if the following conditions are satisfied:

(C1) $(a, a) = 1$ for all $a \in \Pi$, and if a, b are distinct elements of Π then either $(a, b) = -\cos(\pi/m_{ab})$ for some integer $m_{ab} = m_{ba} \geq 2$, or else $(a, b) \leq -1$ (in which case we define $m_{ab} = m_{ba} = \infty$);

(C2) $0 \notin \mathrm{PLC}(\Pi)$, where $\mathrm{PLC}(A)$, for a set A, denotes the set

$$\{\sum_{a\in A} \lambda_a a \mid \lambda_a \geq 0 \text{ for all } a \in A \text{ and } \lambda_{a'} > 0 \text{ for some } a' \in A\}.$$

If Π is a root basis, then we call the triple $\mathscr{C} = (\,V, \Pi, (\ ,\ )\,)$ a *Coxeter datum*. Throughout this paper we fix a particular Coxeter datum $\mathscr{C}$. (C1) implies that for each $a \in \Pi$, $a \notin \mathrm{PLC}(\Pi \setminus \{a\})$. Furthermore, (C1) together with (C2) yield that $\{a, b\}$ is linearly independent for all distinct $a, b \in \Pi$. For each $a \in \Pi$, define $\rho_a \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ by the rule: $\rho_a x = x - 2(x, a)a$, for all $x \in V$. Observe that ρ_a is an involution, and $\rho_a a = -a$. The following proposition summarizes a few useful results:

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20F55 (20F10, 20F65).

Key words and phrases. Coxeter groups, root systems, Tits cone, dominance.

Proposition 1.2. [16, Lecture 1] (i) Suppose that $a, b \in \Pi$ are distinct such that $m_{ab} \neq \infty$. Set $\theta = \cos^{-1}(-(a,b))$. Then

$$(\rho_a\rho_b)^i a = \frac{\sin(2i+1)\theta}{\sin\theta}a + \frac{\sin 2i\theta}{\sin\theta}b,$$

for each integer i, and in particular, $\rho_a\rho_b$ has order m_{ab} in $\mathrm{GL}(V)$.
(ii) Suppose that $a, b \in \Pi$ are distinct such that $m_{ab} = \infty$. Set $\theta = \cosh^{-1}(-(a,b))$. Then

$$(\rho_a\rho_b)^i a = \begin{cases} \frac{\sinh(2i+1)\theta}{\sinh\theta}a + \frac{\sinh 2i\theta}{\sinh\theta}b, & \text{if } \theta \neq 0 \\ (2i+1)a + 2ib, & \text{if } \theta = 0, \end{cases}$$

for each integer i, and in particular, $\rho_a\rho_b$ has infinite order in $\mathrm{GL}(V)$. □

Let $G_{\mathscr{C}}$ be the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ generated by $\{\, \rho_a \mid a \in \Pi \,\}$. Suppose that (W, R) is a Coxeter system in the sense of [14] or [18] with $R = \{\, r_a \mid a \in \Pi \,\}$ being a set of involutions generating W subject only to the condition that $(r_a r_b)^{m_{ab}} = 1$ for all $a, b \in \Pi$ with $m_{ab} \neq \infty$. Then Proposition 1.2 yields that there exists a group homomorphism $\phi_{\mathscr{C}} \colon W \to G_{\mathscr{C}}$ satisfying $\phi_{\mathscr{C}}(r_a) = \rho_a$ for all $a \in \Pi$. This homomorphism together with the $G_{\mathscr{C}}$-action on V give rise to a W-action on V: for each $w \in W$ and $x \in V$, define $wx \in V$ by $wx = \phi_{\mathscr{C}}(w)x$. It can be easily checked that this W-action preserves $(\;,\;)$. Denote the length function of W with respect to R by ℓ, and we have:

Proposition 1.3. [16, Lecture 1, Theorem] *Let $G_{\mathscr{C}}, W, R$ and ℓ be as the above, and let $w \in W$ and $a \in \Pi$. If $\ell(wr_a) \geq \ell(w)$ then $wa \in \mathrm{PLC}(\Pi)$.* □

An immediate consequence of the above proposition is the following important fact:

Corollary 1.4. [16, Lecture 1, Corollary] *Let $G_{\mathscr{C}}, W, R$ and $\phi_{\mathscr{C}}$ be as the above. Then $\phi_{\mathscr{C}} \colon W \to G_{\mathscr{C}}$ is an isomorphism.* □

In particular, the above corollary yields that $(G_{\mathscr{C}}, \{\, \rho_a \mid a \in \Pi \,\})$ is a Coxeter system isomorphic to (W, R). We call (W, R) the *abstract Coxeter system* associated to the Coxeter datum $\mathscr{C}$, and we call W a *Coxeter group* of rank $\#R$ (where $\#$ denotes cardinality).

Definition 1.5. The *root system* of W in V is the set

$$\Phi = \{\, wa \mid w \in W \text{ and } a \in \Pi \,\}.$$

The set $\Phi^+ = \Phi \cap \mathrm{PLC}(\Pi)$ is called the set of *positive roots*, and the set $\Phi^- = -\Phi^+$ is called the set of *negative roots*.

From Proposition 1.3 we may readily deduce that:

Proposition 1.6. ([16, Lecture 3]) (i) Let $w \in W$ and $a \in \Pi$. Then

$$\ell(wr_a) = \begin{cases} \ell(w) - 1, \text{ if } wa \in \Phi^-, \\ \ell(w) + 1, \text{ if } wa \in \Phi^+. \end{cases}$$

(ii) $\Phi = \Phi^+ \biguplus \Phi^-$, where $\biguplus$ denotes disjoint union.
(iii) W is finite if and only if Φ is finite. $\square$

Define $T = \bigcup_{w \in W} wRw^{-1}$. We call T the set of *reflections* in W. For each $x \in \Phi$, let $\rho_x \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ be defined by the rule: $\rho_x(v) = v - 2(v, x)x$, for all $v \in V$. Since $x \in \Phi$, it follows that $x = wa$ for some $w \in W$ and $a \in \Pi$. Direct calculations yield that $\rho_x = (\phi_{\mathscr{C}}(w))\rho_a(\phi_{\mathscr{C}}(w))^{-1} \in G_{\mathscr{C}}$. Now let $r_x \in W$ be such that $\phi_{\mathscr{C}}(r_x) = \rho_x$. Then $r_x = wr_aw^{-1} \in T$ and we call it the reflection corresponding to x. It is readily checked that $r_x = r_{-x}$ for all $x \in \Phi$ and $T = \{r_x \mid x \in \Phi\}$. For each $t \in T$ we let α_t be the unique positive root with the property that $r_{\alpha_t} = t$. It is also easily checked that there is a bijection $\psi \colon T \to \Phi^+$ given by $\psi(t) = \alpha_t$.

For each $x \in \Phi^+$, as in [3], we define the *depth* of x relative to R to be $\min\{\, \ell(w) \mid w \in W \text{ and } wx \in \Phi^- \,\}$, and we denote it by $\mathrm{dp}(x)$. The following lemma gives basic properties of depth:

Lemma 1.7. ([3, Lemma 1.7]). *Let $r \in R$ and $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \{\alpha_r\}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{dp}(r\alpha) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{dp}(\alpha) - 1 & \text{if } (\alpha, \alpha_r) > 0, \\ \mathrm{dp}(\alpha) & \text{if } (\alpha, \alpha_r) = 0, \\ \mathrm{dp}(\alpha) + 1 & \text{if } (\alpha, \alpha_r) < 0. \end{cases}$$

$\square$

Define functions $N \colon W \to \mathcal{P}(\Phi^+)$ and $\overline{N} \colon W \to \mathcal{P}(T)$ (where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes power set) by setting $N(w) = \{\, x \in \Phi^+ \mid wx \in \Phi^- \,\}$ and $\overline{N}(w) = \{\, t \in T \mid \ell(wt) < \ell(w) \,\}$ for all $w \in W$. We call $\overline{N}$ the *reflection cocycle* of W. Standard arguments as those in [18] yield that for each $w \in W$,

$$\ell(w) = \#N(w) \tag{1.1}$$

and

$$\overline{N}(w) = \{\, r_x \mid x \in N(w) \,\}. \tag{1.2}$$

In particular, $N(r_a) = \{a\}$ for $a \in \Pi$. Moreover, $\ell(wv^{-1}) + \ell(v) = \ell(w)$, for some $w, v \in W$ if and only if $N(v) \subseteq N(w)$.

A subgroup W' of W is a *reflection subgroup* of W if $W' = \langle W' \cap T \rangle$ (W' is generated by the reflections contained in it). For any reflection subgroup W' of W, let

$$S(W') = \{\, t \in T \mid \overline{N}(t) \cap W' = \{t\} \,\}$$

and

$$\Delta(W') = \{\, x \in \Phi^+ \mid r_x \in S(W') \,\}.$$

It was shown by Dyer ([7]) and Deodhar ([5]) that $(W', S(W'))$ forms a Coxeter system:

Theorem 1.8. (Dyer) (i) Suppose that W' is an arbitrary reflection subgroup of W. Then $(W', S(W'))$ forms a Coxeter system. Moreover, $W' \cap T = \bigcup_{w \in W'} wS(W')w^{-1}$.
(ii) Suppose that W' is a reflection subgroup of W, and suppose that $a, b \in \Delta(W')$ are distinct. Then

$$(a, b) \in \{\, -\cos(\pi/n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } n \geq 2 \,\} \cup (-\infty, -1].$$

And conversely if Δ is a subset of Φ^+ satisfying the condition that

$$(a, b) \in \{\, -\cos(\pi/n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } n \geq 2 \,\} \cup (-\infty, -1]$$

for all $a, b \in \Delta$ with $a \neq b$, then $\Delta = \Delta(W')$ for some reflection subgroup W' of W. In fact, $W' = \langle \{\, r_a \mid a \in \Delta \,\} \rangle$.

Proof. (i) [7, Theorem 3.3].
(ii) [7, Theorem 4.4]. □

Let $(\,,\,)'$ be the restriction of $(\,,\,)$ on the subspace $\operatorname{span}(\Delta(W'))$ of V. Then $\mathscr{C}' = (\operatorname{span}(\Delta(W')), \Delta(W'), (\,,\,)')$ is a Coxeter datum with $(W', S(W'))$ being the associated abstract Coxeter system. Thus the notion of a root system applies to $\mathscr{C}'$. We let $\Phi(W')$, $\Phi^+(W')$ and $\Phi^-(W')$ be, respectively, the set of roots, positive roots and negative roots for the datum $\mathscr{C}'$. Then $\Phi(W') = W'\Delta(W')$ and Theorem 1.8 (i) yields that $\Phi(W') = \{x \in \Phi \mid r_x \in W'\}$. Furthermore, we have $\Phi^+(W') = \Phi(W') \cap \operatorname{PLC}(\Delta(W'))$ and $\Phi^-(W') = -\Phi^+(W')$. We call $S(W')$ the set of *canonical generators* of W', and we call $\Delta(W')$ the set of *canonical roots* of $\Phi(W')$. In this paper a reflection subgroup W' is called a *dihedral reflection subgroup* if $\#S(W') = 2$.

A subset Φ' of Φ is called a *root subsystem* if $r_y x \in \Phi'$ whenever x, y are both in Φ'. It is easily seen that there is a bijective correspondence between the set of reflection subgroups W' of W and the set of root subsystems Φ' of Φ: W' uniquely determines the root subsystem $\Phi(W')$, and Φ' uniquely determines the reflection subgroup $\langle \{\, r_x \mid x \in \Phi' \,\} \rangle$.

The notion of a length function also applies to the Coxeter system $(W', S(W'))$, and we let $\ell_{(W',\, S(W'))} \colon W' \to \mathbb{N}$ be the length function for $(W', S(W'))$. If $w \in W'$ and $a \in \Delta(W')$ then applying Proposition 1.6 to the Coxeter datum $\mathscr{C}' = (\operatorname{span}(\Delta(W'))$ yields

$$\ell_{(W', S(W'))}(wr_a) = \begin{cases} \ell_{(W', S(W'))}(w) - 1, \text{ if } wa \in \Phi^-(W'), \\ \ell_{(W', S(W'))}(w) + 1, \text{ if } wa \in \Phi^+(W'). \end{cases}$$

Similarly the notion of a reflection cocycle also applies to the Coxeter system $(W', S(W'))$. Let $\overline{N}_{(W', S(W'))} \colon W \to \mathcal{P}(W' \cap T)$ denote the reflection cocycle for $(W', S(W'))$. Then for each $w \in W'$,

$$\overline{N}_{(W', S(W'))}(w) = \{\, t \in W' \cap T \mid \ell_{(W', S(W'))}(wt) < \ell_{(W', S(W'))}(w) \,\}.$$

And we define $N_{(W', S(W'))}(w) = \{\, x \in \Phi^+(W') \mid wx \in \Phi^-(W') \,\}$, for each $w \in W'$. It is shown in [6] that $\overline{N}_{(W',\, S(W'))}(w) = \overline{N}(w) \cap W'$ for arbitrary reflection subgroup W' of W. Furthermore, it is readily seen that the bijection ψ restricts to a bijection $\psi'\colon T \cap W' \to \Phi^+(W')$ given by $\psi'(t) = \alpha_t$. For $w \in W'$, applying (1.1) to the Coxeter datum $\mathscr{C}' = (\, \mathrm{span}(\Delta(W'), \Delta(W'), (\ ,\ )'\,)$ yields that

$$\ell_{(W', S(W'))}(w) = \# N_{(W', S(W'))}(w). \tag{1.3}$$

Furthermore, $\ell_{(W', S(W'))}(wv^{-1}) + \ell_{(W', S(W'))}(v) = \ell_{(W', S(W'))}(w)$, for some $w, v \in W'$, precisely when $N_{(W', S(W'))}(v) \subseteq N_{(W', S(W'))}(w)$.

For a Coxeter datum $\mathscr{C} = (\, V, \Pi, (\ ,\ )\,)$, since Π may be linearly dependent, the expression of a root in Φ as a linear combination of elements of Π may not be unique. Thus the concept of the coefficient of an element of Π in any given root in Φ is potentially ambiguous. We close this section by specifying a canonical way of expressing a root in Φ as a linear combination of elements from Π. This canonical expression follows from a standard construction similar to that considered in [17].

Given a Coxeter datum $\mathscr{C} = (\, V, \Pi, (\ ,\ )\,)$, let E be a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ with basis $\Pi_E = \{\, e_a \mid a \in \Pi \,\}$ in bijective correspondence with Π, and let $(\ ,\ )_E$ be the unique bilinear form on E satisfying

$$(e_a, e_b)_E = (a, b) \text{ for all } a, b \in \Pi.$$

Then $\mathscr{C}_E = (\, E, \Pi_E, (\ ,\ )_E\,)$ is a Coxeter datum. Moreover, $\mathscr{C}_E$ and $\mathscr{C}$ are associated to the same abstract Coxeter system (W, R); indeed Corollary 1.4 yields that the abstract Coxeter group W is isomorphic to both $G_{\mathscr{C}} = \langle \{\, \rho_a \mid a \in \Pi \,\} \rangle$ and $G_{\mathscr{C}_E} = \langle \{\, \rho_{e_a} \mid a \in \Pi \,\} \rangle$. Furthermore, W acts faithfully on E via $r_a y = \rho_{e_a} y$ for all $a \in \Pi$ and $y \in E$.

Let $f\colon E \to V$ be the unique linear map satisfying $f(e_a) = a$, for all $a \in \Pi$. It is readily checked that $(f(x), f(y)) = (x, y)_E$, for all $x, y \in E$. Now for all $a \in \Pi$ and $y \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} r_a(f(y)) = \rho_a(f(y)) = f(y) - 2(f(y), a)a &= f(y) - 2(f(y), f(e_a))f(e_a) \\ &= f(y - 2(y, e_a)_E e_a) \\ &= f(r_a y). \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows that $w(f(y)) = f(wy)$, for all $w \in W$ and all $y \in E$, since W is generated by $\{\, r_a \mid a \in \Pi \,\}$. Let Φ_E denote the root system associated to the datum $\mathscr{C}_E$. Standard arguments yield that:

Proposition 1.9. [11, Proposition 2.1] *The restriction of f defines a W-equivariant bijection $\Phi_E \leftrightarrow \Phi$.* ☐

Since Π_E is linearly independent, it follows that each root $y \in \Phi_E$ can be written uniquely as $y = \sum_{e_a \in \Pi_E} \lambda_a e_a$; we say that λ_a is the *coefficient* of e_a in y, and it is denoted by $\mathrm{coeff}_{e_a}(y)$. We use this fact together with the W-equivariant bijection $f\colon \Phi_E \leftrightarrow \Phi$ to give a canonical expression of a root in Φ in terms of Π:

Definition 1.10. Suppose that $x \in \Phi$. For each $a \in \Pi$, define the *canonical coefficient* of a in x, written $\operatorname{coeff}_a(x)$, by requiring that $\operatorname{coeff}_a(x) = \operatorname{coeff}_{e_a}(f^{-1}(x))$. The *support*, written $\operatorname{supp}(x)$, is the set of $a \in \Pi$ with $\operatorname{coeff}_a(x) \neq 0$.

2. Dominance, Maximal Dihedral Reflection Subgroups and Infinity Height

Throughout this section, let W be the abstract Coxeter group associated to the Coxeter datum $\mathscr{C} = (\,V,\, \Pi,\, (\;,\;)\,)$, and let Φ and T be the corresponding root system and the set of reflections respectively. Recently in [9], a uniquely determined non-negative integer, called ∞-*height*, is assigned to each reflection in W. Naturally, the set T is then the disjoint union of the sets T_0, T_1, T_2, …, where the set T_n consists of all the reflections with ∞-height equal to n.

These T_n's were utilized to demonstrate nice regularity properties of W ([9, Ch 5]). Furthermore, they gave rise to a family of modules in the generic Iwahori-Hecke algebra associated to W, and in turn, these modules were used to prove a weak form of Lusztig's conjecture on the boundedness of the **a**-function (Dyer, unpublished). It is also known (Dyer, unpublished) that if W is of finite rank, then there are finitely many reflections in T_n for each n.

In this section we prove that for an arbitrary reflection $t \in T$ whose ∞-height equals n, the corresponding positive root α_t dominates precisely n other positive roots. This observation will then establish a bijection between the set of all reflections in W with ∞-height equal to n and the set of all positive roots each dominates precisely n other positive roots. Recent results on dominance obtained in [11] may then be immediately applied to the T_n's, answering a number of basic questions about these T_n's.

Following [17], we generalize the definition of dominance to the whole of Φ (whereas in [3] and [4], dominance was only defined on Φ^+), and we stress that all the notations are the same as in the previous section.

Definition 2.1. (i) Let W' be a reflection subgroup of W, and let $x, y \in \Phi(W')$. Then we say that x *dominates* y with respect to W' if

$$\{\, w \in W' \mid wx \in \Phi^-(W') \,\} \subseteq \{\, w \in W' \mid wy \in \Phi^-(W') \,\}.$$

If x dominates y with respect to W' then we write $x \operatorname{dom}_{W'} y$.
(ii) Let W' be a reflection subgroup of W and let $x \in \Phi^+(W')$. Define $D_{W'}(x) = \{\, y \in \Phi^+(W') \mid y \neq x \text{ and } x \operatorname{dom}_{W'} y \,\}$. If $D_{W'}(x) = \emptyset$ then we call x *elementary with respect to* W'. For each non-negative integer n, define $D_{W',n} = \{\, x \in \Phi^+(W') \mid \#D_{W'}(x) = n \,\}$. In the case that $W' = W$, we write $D(x)$ and D_n in places of $D_{W'}(x)$ and $D_{W',n}$ respectively. If $D(x) = \emptyset$ then we call x *elementary*.

It is readily checked that dominance with respect to any reflection subgroup W' of a Coxeter group W is a partial ordering on $\Phi(W')$. The following lemma summarizes some basic properties of dominance:

Lemma 2.2. ([11, Lemma 2.2]) (i) Let $x, y \in \Phi^+$ be arbitrary. Then $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$ if and only if $(x, y) \geq 1$ and $\operatorname{dp}(x) \geq \operatorname{dp}(y)$.
(ii) Dominance is W-invariant, that is, if $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$ then $wx \operatorname{dom}_W wy$ for all $w \in W$.
(iii) Let $x, y \in \Phi$ be such that $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$. Then $-y \operatorname{dom}_W -x$.
(iv) Let $x, y \in \Phi$. Then there is dominance between x and y if and only if $(x, y) \geq 1$. ☐

Corollary 2.3. (i) Let W' be a reflection subgroup of W and let $x, y \in \Phi(W')$. Then there is dominance with respect to W' between x and y if and only if $(x, y)' \geq 1$, where $(\,,\,)'$ is the restriction of $(\,,\,)$ to the subspace $\operatorname{span}(\Delta(W'))$.
(ii) Suppose that $x, y \in \Phi$ are distinct. Then $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$ if and only if $x \operatorname{dom}_{W'} y$ for every reflection subgroup W' of W containing both r_x and r_y.

Proof. (i) Follows from Lemma 2.2 (iv) applied to the Coxeter group W' and the datum $\mathscr{C}' = (\operatorname{span}(\Delta(W')), \Delta(W'), (\,,\,)')$.
(ii) Let W' be an arbitrary reflection subgroup of W containing both r_x and r_y. It is clear that $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$ implies that $x \operatorname{dom}_{W'} y$. Conversely, suppose that $x \operatorname{dom}_{W'} y$. Then part (i) yields that $(x, y) = (x, y)' \geq 1$. Thus Lemma 2.2 (iv) yields that either $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$, or else $y \operatorname{dom}_W x$. If the latter is the case, then by the first part of the current proof, $y \operatorname{dom}_{W'} x$, and hence it follows that $x = y$ (since dominance with respect to W' is a partial ordering), contradicting our choice of x and y. ☐

The following is a well-known result on dihedral reflection subgroups, and for completeness a proof is included here.

Proposition 2.4. (Dyer [8]) *Suppose that $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi^+$ are distinct. Let $W' = \langle \{ r_\gamma \mid \gamma \in (\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Phi^+ \} \rangle$. Then W' is a dihedral reflection subgroup of W.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that W' is not dihedral. Then $\#S(W') \geq 3$, and let $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \Delta(W')$ be distinct. Theorem 1.8 (ii) then yields that $(x_i, x_j) \leq 0$ whenever $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ are different. Clearly x_1, x_2, x_3 are all in the two dimensional subspace $\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta$, and thus a contradiction arises if we could show that x_1, x_2, x_3 are linearly independent. Let $c_1, c_2, c_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 + c_3x_3 = 0$. Since $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \Phi^+$, and $0 \notin \operatorname{PLC}(\Pi)$, it follows that c_1, c_2, c_3 cannot be all positive or all negative. Rename x_1, x_2, x_3 if necessary, we have the following three possibilities:

$$c_1, c_2 \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c_3 < 0, \tag{2.1}$$

or

$$c_1, c_2 \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c_3 > 0, \tag{2.2}$$

or

$$c_1, c_2, c_3 = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

If (2.1) is the case then $0 = (c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 + c_3x_3, x_3) < 0$, and if (2.2) is the case then $0 = (c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 + c_3x_3, x_3) > 0$, both are clearly absurd. Hence (2.3) must be the case and x_1, x_2, x_3 are linearly independent, a contradiction as required. ☐

Let $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi^+$ be distinct. Let W'' be an arbitrary dihedral reflection subgroup of W containing the dihedral reflection subgroup $\langle\{r_\alpha, r_\beta\}\rangle$. Let x, y be the canonical roots for W''. It can be readily checked that $\mathbb{R}x + \mathbb{R}y = \mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta$, and hence $x, y \in (\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Phi^+$. It then follows that $W'' \subseteq \langle\, \{\, r_\gamma \mid \gamma \in (\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Phi^+ \,\}\,\rangle$. This observation together with Proposition 2.4 readily yield the following well-known result:

Proposition 2.5. *Every dihedral reflection subgroup* $\langle\{r_\alpha, r_\beta\}\rangle$ *of* W *(where* $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi^+$ *are distinct), is contained in a unique maximal dihedral reflection subgroup, namely* $\langle\, \{\, r_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Phi^+ \cap (\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \,\}\,\rangle$. ☐

Definition 2.6. (i) Define $\mathscr{M}$ to be the set of all maximal dihedral reflection subgroups of W.
(ii) Define $\mathscr{M}_\infty$ to be the set $\{\, W' \in \mathscr{M} \mid \#W' = \infty \,\}$.
(iii) For each $t \in T$, define $\mathscr{M}_t$ to be the set $\{\, W' \in \mathscr{M} \mid t \in W' \,\}$.
(iv) Let W' be a reflection subgroup of W, and let $t \in W' \cap T$. Define the *standard height*, $h_{(W', S(W'))}(t)$, of t with respect to the Coxeter system $(W', S(W'))$ to be

$$\min\{\, \ell_{(W', S(W'))}(w) \mid w \in W',\ w\alpha_t \in \Delta(W') \,\}.$$

For the standard height of t with respect to the Coxeter system (W, R), we simply write $h(t)$ in place of $h_{(W,\,R)}(t)$.

Remark 2.7. From the remark immediately following (1.3) it is readily checked that

$$h_{(W', S(W'))}(t) = \frac{\ell_{(W', S(W'))}(t) - 1}{2} \tag{2.4}$$

whenever W' is a reflection subgroup of W, and $t \in W' \cap T$. Thus our definition of the standard height agrees with that in [9]. Observe that (2.4) applied to the Coxeter system (W, R) yields that for each $t \in T$,

$$h(t) = \min\{\, \ell(w) \mid w \in W \text{ and } w\alpha_t \in \Pi \,\}, \tag{2.5}$$

and this is, of course, consistent with Definition 2.6.

The following appears in [9], and for completeness we give a proof here:

Lemma 2.8. *For each $t \in T$, we have $T \setminus \{t\} = \biguplus_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t} ((W' \cap T) \setminus \{t\})$.*

Proof. It is readily checked that $T \setminus \{t\} = \bigcup_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t} ((W' \cap T) \setminus \{t\})$, and hence we only need to check that this union is indeed disjoint. Suppose for a contradiction that there are distinct $W_1, W_2 \in \mathscr{M}_t$ with $r \in W_1 \cap W_2$ for some $r \in T \setminus \{t\}$. Then clearly $\langle \{r, t\} \rangle \subseteq W_1$ and $\langle \{r, t\} \rangle \subseteq W_2$, contradicting Proposition 2.5. ☐

The bijection $\psi \colon T \leftrightarrow \Phi^+$ and the above immediately yield that:

Corollary 2.9. $\Phi^+ \setminus \mathbb{R}\alpha = \biguplus_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t} (\Phi^+(W') \setminus \mathbb{R}\alpha)$, *for each $\alpha \in \Phi^+$.* ☐

Lemma 2.10. ([9]) *Let $t \in T$ be arbitrary. Then*

$$h(t) = \sum_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t} h_{(W',\, S(W'))}(t).$$

Proof. For any reflection $t \in T$, Corollary 2.9 yields that

$$\{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid t\alpha \in \Phi^-\} = \{\alpha_t\} \cup (\biguplus_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t} \{\alpha \in \Phi^+(W') \setminus \mathbb{R}\alpha_t \mid t\alpha \in \Phi^- \}). \tag{2.6}$$

Since $h(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\ell(t) - 1) = \frac{1}{2}(\#N(t) - 1)$, it follows from (2.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) &= \frac{1}{2}(\sum_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t} \#\{\alpha \in \Phi^+(W') \setminus \mathbb{R}\alpha_t \mid t\alpha \in \Phi^-(W') \}) \\ &= \sum_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t} \frac{1}{2}(\ell_{(W', S(W'))}(t) - 1) \qquad (\text{ by } (1.3)) \\ &= \sum_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t} h_{(W', S(W'))}(t) \qquad (\text{ by } (2.4)) . \end{aligned}$$

☐

Definition 2.11. ([9]) For $t \in T$, define the ∞-*height* of t to be

$$h^\infty(t) = \sum_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty} h_{(W',\, S(W'))}(t),$$

and for each non-negative integer n, we define

$$T_n = \{t \in T \mid h^\infty(t) = n\}.$$

Observe that from the above definition, it is not clear that for a specific non-negative integer n, whether there is any reflection $t \in T$ with $h^\infty(t) = n$. It turns out that a number of basic questions like this can in fact be proved with the aid of the results obtained in [11] once we prove the following:

Theorem 2.12. *For each non-negative integer n, there is a bijection $T_n \leftrightarrow D_n$ given by $t \leftrightarrow \alpha_t$.*

To prove the above theorem we need a few technical results first.

Proposition 2.13. *Suppose that* $t \in T$*, and let* $W' \in \mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty$ *be such that* $h_{(W',\ S(W'))}(t) \geq 1$*. Then there exists some* $x \in \Phi^+(W')$ *with* $\alpha_t \operatorname{dom}_W x$*.*

Proof. Let $\{r, s\} = S(W')$. Then $\alpha_r, \alpha_s \in \Phi^+(W')$, and Proposition 4.5.4 of [1] yields that $(\alpha_r, \alpha_s) \leq -1$. Since $h_{(W',\ S(W'))}(t) \geq 1$, it follows that $\alpha_t \notin \{\alpha_r, \alpha_s\}$. Set $\theta = \cosh^{-1}(-(\alpha_r, \alpha_s))$, and for each integer n, set $c_n = \frac{\sinh(n\theta)}{\sinh\theta}$ when $\theta \neq 0$, and set $c_n = n$ when $\theta = 0$. Then direct calculation shows that $\alpha_t = c_m\alpha_r + c_{m\pm1}\alpha_s$ for some integer m (not equal to zero). If $\alpha_t = c_m\alpha_r + c_{m+1}\alpha_s$ then either $(\alpha_t, \alpha_s) = \cosh(m\theta) \geq 1$ (if $\theta \neq 0$), or else $(\alpha_t, \alpha_s) = 1$ (if $\theta = 0$), and hence Lemma 2.2 (i) yields that $\alpha_t \operatorname{dom}_W \alpha_s \in \Phi^+(W')$. On the other hand, if $\alpha_t = c_m\alpha_r + c_{m-1}\alpha_s$ then either $(\alpha_t, \alpha_r) = \cosh((m-1)\theta) \geq 1$ (if $\theta \neq 0$) or else $(\alpha_t, \alpha_r) = 1$ (if $\theta = 0$), and hence Lemma 2.2 (i) yields that $\alpha_t \operatorname{dom}_W \alpha_r \in \Phi^+(W')$. ☐

The following is a well-known result whose proof can be found in the remarks immediately before Lemma 2.3 of [3]:

Lemma 2.14. ([3]) *There is no non-trivial dominance between positive roots in the root system of a finite Coxeter group.* ☐

Proposition 2.15. *Suppose that* $x, y \in \Phi^+$ *are distinct with* $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$*, and let* W' *be the unique maximal dihedral reflection subgroup of* W *containing* $\langle\{r_x, r_y\}\rangle$*. Then* $h_{(W',\ S(W'))}(r_x) \geq 1$*.*

Proof. It follows from Corollary 2.3 (ii) that $x \operatorname{dom}_{W'} y$, so Lemma 2.14 above yields that W' is an infinite Coxeter group. Let $\{\alpha, \beta\} = \Delta(W')$. Then Proposition 4.5.4 of [1] yields that $(\alpha, \beta) \leq -1$. Hence it follows from Lemma 2.2 (iv) that $\alpha \operatorname{dom}_W -\beta$ and $\beta \operatorname{dom}_W -\alpha$. It then follows readily that there are two dominance chains in $\Phi(W')$, namely:

$$\begin{aligned}\cdots \operatorname{dom}_W\ & r_\alpha r_\beta r_\alpha(\beta)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ r_\alpha r_\beta(\alpha)\ \operatorname{dom}_W r_\alpha(\beta)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ \alpha \\ & \operatorname{dom}_W\ (-\beta)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ r_\beta(-\alpha)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ r_\beta r_\alpha(-\beta)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\cdots \operatorname{dom}_W\ & r_\beta r_\alpha r_\beta(\alpha)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ r_\beta r_\alpha(\beta)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ r_\beta(\alpha)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ \beta \\ & \operatorname{dom}_W(-\alpha)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ r_\alpha(-\beta)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ r_\alpha r_\beta(-\alpha)\ \operatorname{dom}_W\ \cdots . \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Observe that each element of $\Phi(W')$ lies in exactly one of the above chains, and the negative of any element of one chain lies in the other. Further, from (2.7) and (2.8) it is clear that the roots in $\Phi(W')$ dominated by either α or β are all negative. Since $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$ with $y \in \Phi^+$, it follows that $x \notin \{\alpha, \beta\}$, and consequently $h_{(W',\ S(W'))}(r_x) \geq 1$. ☐

From the last two propositions we may deduce the following special case of Theorem 2.12:

Lemma 2.16. *There is a bijection* $T_0 \leftrightarrow D_0$ *given by* $t \leftrightarrow \alpha_t$*.*

Proof. Let $t \in T_0$, and suppose for a contradiction that $\alpha_t \notin D_0$. Then there exists $s \in T \setminus \{t\}$ such that $\alpha_t \operatorname{dom}_W \alpha_s$. Let W' be the unique maximal dihedral reflection subgroup of W containing $\langle\{s, t\}\rangle$. Proposition 2.15 yields that $h_{(W',\, S(W'))}(t) \geq 1$. Since $\alpha_t \operatorname{dom}_W \alpha_s$, it follows from Lemma 2.14 that $W' \in \mathscr{M}_\infty$, and consequently $h^\infty(t) \geq 1$, contradicting the assumption that $t \in T_0$.

Conversely, suppose that $\alpha_t \in D_0$, and suppose for a contradiction that $t \notin T_0$. Then there exists some $W' \in \mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty$ with $h_{(W',\, S(W'))}(t) \geq 1$. But then Proposition 2.13 yields that $\alpha_t \notin D_0$, producing a contradiction as required. □

Lemma 2.17. *Let $t \in T$, and suppose that $W_1, W_2 \in \mathscr{M}_t$ are distinct. Then $\Phi^+(W_1) \cap \Phi^+(W_2) = \{\alpha_t\}$.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there is $y \in \Phi^+(W_1) \cap \Phi^+(W_2)$, and $\alpha_t \neq y$. Then $\langle\{t, r_y\}\rangle$ is a dihedral reflection subgroup of W. But then $\langle\{t, r_y\}\rangle$ is contained in both W_1 and W_2, contradicting Proposition 2.5. □

Proposition 2.18. *Suppose that $t \in T$, and $W' \in \mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty$. Then*

$$\#D_{W'}(\alpha_t) = h_{(W',\, S(W'))}(t).$$

Proof. Let $\{r, s\} = S(W')$. Since $W' \in \mathscr{M}_\infty$, Proposition 4.5.4 of [1] yields that $(\alpha_r, \alpha_s) \leq -1$. Then it follows from Lemma 2.2 (iv) that $\alpha_r \operatorname{dom}_W -\alpha_s$ and $\alpha_s \operatorname{dom}_W -\alpha_r$. Similar to the proof of Proposition 2.15 there are two dominance chains in $\Phi(W')$, namely:

$$\begin{aligned}\cdots \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ rsr(\alpha_s)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ rs(\alpha_r)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'} r(\alpha_s)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ \alpha_r \\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ (-\alpha_s)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ s(-\alpha_r)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ sr(-\alpha_s)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\cdots \operatorname{dom}_{W'} srs(\alpha_r)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ sr(\alpha_s)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ s(\alpha_r)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ \alpha_s \\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}(-\alpha_r)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ r(-\alpha_s)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ rs(-\alpha_r)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ \cdots . \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Note that there is dominance between $x, y \in \Phi(W')$ if and only if x and y are in the same chain. Observe that (2.9) and (2.10) readily imply that

$$\min\{\, \ell_{(W',\, S(W'))}(w) \mid w \in W' \text{ and } w\alpha_t \in \{\alpha_r, \alpha_s\}\,\} = \#D_{W'}(\alpha_t),$$

and consequently $h_{(W',\, S(W'))}(t) = \#D_{W'}(\alpha_t)$, as required. □

Proposition 2.19. *Suppose that $t \in T$ is arbitrary. Then*

$$\biguplus_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty} D_{W'}(\alpha_t) = D(\alpha_t).$$

Proof. First we observe that Lemma 2.17 yields that the union of the sets $D_{W'}(\alpha_t)$ over all W' in $\mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty$ is indeed disjoint.

Suppose that $W' \in \mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty$, and $x \in D_{W'}(\alpha_t)$. Then Corollary 2.3 (ii) yields that $\alpha_t \operatorname{dom}_W x$ too, and hence it is clear that

$$\biguplus_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty} D_{W'}(\alpha_t) \subseteq D(\alpha_t).$$

Conversely, suppose that $x \in D(\alpha_t)$. Let W' be the unique maximal dihedral reflection subgroup of W containing $\langle\{t, r_x\}\rangle$. Then Corollary 2.3 (ii) yields that $\alpha_t \operatorname{dom}_{W'} x$. Finally since there is no non-trivial dominance in any finite Coxeter group, it follows that $W' \in \mathscr{M}_\infty$, as required. ☐

Now we prove that for any reflection $t \in W$, its ∞-height $h^\infty(t)$ equals the the number of positive roots strictly dominated by α_t:

Theorem 2.20. *Let $t \in T$ be arbitrary. Then $h^\infty(t) = \#D(\alpha_t)$.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 2.18 and Proposition 2.19 that

$$h^\infty(t) = \sum_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty} h_{(W',\, S(W'))}(t) = \sum_{W' \in \mathscr{M}_t \cap \mathscr{M}_\infty} \#D_{W'}(\alpha_t) = \#D(\alpha_t).$$

☐

Finally we are in a position to prove Theorem 2.12:

Proof of Theorem 2.12. The desired result follows immediately from Theorem 2.20. ☐

Now combining Theorem 3.8 of [11], Corollary 3.9 of [11], Corollary 3.21 of [11] and Theorem 2.12 above we may deduce:

Corollary 2.21. (i) *For each positive integer n,*

$$T_n \subseteq \{\, tt't \mid t \in T_0 \text{ and } t' \in D_m \text{ for some } m \leq n-1 \,\}.$$

(ii) *Suppose that W is an infinite Coxeter group with $\#R < \infty$. Then $0 < \#T_n \leq (\#T_0)^{n+1} - (\#T_0)^n$ for each positive integer n.*

☐

3. Dominance and Imaginary Cone

Kac introduced the the concept of an *imaginary cone* in the study of the imaginary roots of Kac-Moody Lie algebras. In [19, Ch 5] the imaginary cone of a Kac-Moody Lie algebra was defined to be the convex hull of its positive imaginary roots and zero. The generalization of imaginary cones to arbitrary Coxeter groups was first introduced by Hée in [12], and subsequently reproduced in [13]. This generalization has also been studied by Dyer (unpublished) and Edgar ([9]). In this section we investigate the connections between this generalized imaginary cone and dominance in Coxeter groups, in particular, we show that whenever x and y are roots of a Coxeter group, with x dominating

y, then $x-y$ lies in the imaginary cone of that Coxeter group (a result due to Dyer).

Let (W,R) be the abstract Coxeter system associated to the Coxeter datum $\mathscr{C} = (\,V,\Pi,(\ ,\ )\,)$ and let Φ be the corresponding root system. For any real vector space X we write $X^* = \operatorname{Hom}(X,\mathbb{R})$. In this section we take X to be some suitable subspace of V. Also in this paper all *cones* are assumed to be convex cones. For any cone C in X, we define $C^* = \{\, f \in X^* \mid f(v) \geq 0 \text{ for all } v \in C\,\}$ and call it the *dual* of C; and for any cone F in X^*, we define $F^* = \{\, v \in X \mid f(v) \geq 0 \text{ for all } f \in F\,\}$ and call it the *dual* of F. If W acts on X, then it is readily checked that W also acts on X^* in the following way: if $w \in W$ and $f \in X^*$ then $wf \in X^*$ is given by the rule $(wf)(v) = f(w^{-1}v)$ for all $v \in X$.

The following is a well-known result whose proof can be found in [16, Notes (c), Lecture 1]:

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that X is a real vector space of finite dimension, and let C be a cone in X. Then $(C^*)^* = \overline{C}$, where $\overline{C}$ is the topological closure of C in X (with respect to the standard topology on X).* ☐

Set $P = \operatorname{PLC}(\Pi) \cup \{0\}$. It is clear that P is a cone in V. We define the Tits cone of W in the same way as in 5.13 of [18]:

Definition 3.2. The *Tits cone* of the Coxeter group W is the W-invariant set $U = \bigcup_{w\in W} wP^*$.

It can be checked that U consists of all $f \in (\operatorname{span}(\Pi))^*$ such that $f(x) \geq 0$ for all but finitely many positive roots x.

Lemma 3.3. *$U^* = \bigcap\limits_{w\in W} w(P^*)^*$. Furthermore, $U^* = \bigcap\limits_{w\in W} wP$, whenever Π is a finite set.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} U^* &= \{\, v \in V \mid f(v) \geq 0, \text{ for all } f \in U\,\} \\ &= \{\, v \in V \mid (w\phi)(v) \geq 0, \text{ for all } \phi \in P^*, \text{ and for all } w \in W\,\} \\ &= \{\, v \in V \mid \phi(w^{-1}v) \geq 0, \text{ for all } \phi \in P^*, \text{ and for all } w \in W\,\} \\ &= \bigcap_{w\in W} \{\, v \in V \mid \phi(w^{-1}v) \geq 0, \text{ for all } \phi \in P^*\,\} \\ &= \bigcap_{w\in W} \{\, wv \in V \mid \phi(v) \geq 0, \text{ for all } \phi \in P^*\,\} \\ &= \bigcap_{w\in W} \{\, wv \in V \mid v \in (P^*)^*\,\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Let $X = \operatorname{span}(\Pi)$. If $\#\Pi$ is finite then it follows from Lemma 3.1 that $(P^*)^* = \overline{P}$. It is clear that P is topologically closed, hence (3.1) yields that $U^* = \bigcap_{w\in W} wP$ when Π is a finite set. ☐

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that $v \in V$ has the property that $(a, v) \le 0$ for all $a \in \Pi$. Then $wv - v \in P$ for all $w \in W$. Moreover, if $v \in P$ then $v \in U^*$.*

Proof. Use induction on $\ell(w)$. Noting that if $\ell(w) = 0$ then there is nothing to prove. If $\ell(w) \ge 1$ then we may write $w = w' r_a$ where $w' \in W$ and $a \in \Pi$ with $\ell(w) = \ell(w') + 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} wv - v = (w' r_a)v - v &= w'(v - 2(v, a)a) - v \\ &= (w'v - v) - 2(a, v)w'a. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $w'a \in \Phi^+ \subset P$, and by the inductive hypothesis $w'v - v \in P$. Since $(a, v) \le 0$, it follows from the above that $wv - v \in P$.

If $v \in P$ then $wv = (wv - v) + v \in P$ for all $w \in W$, and hence $v \in \bigcap\limits_{w \in W} w^{-1}P \subseteq U^*$. ☐

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose that $x, y \in \Phi$ are distinct with $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$. Then $w(x - y) \in \mathrm{PLC}(\Pi)$ for all $w \in W$, that is, $x - y \in U^*$.*

Proof. Since $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$, Lemma 2.2 (iv) yields that $(x, y) \ge 1$. Let W' be the (infinite) dihedral subgroup of W generated by r_x and r_y. Let $S(W') = \{s, t\}$ and $\triangle(W') = \{\alpha_s, \alpha_t\}$. Proposition 3.4 of [11] yields that $(\alpha_s, \alpha_t) = -(x, y) \le -1$. Let $\theta = \cosh^{-1}(-(\alpha_s, \alpha_t))$ and for each integer i, write $c_i = \frac{\sinh(i\theta)}{\sinh\theta}$ if $\theta \ne 0$, and write $c_i = i$ if $\theta = 0$. It follows from calculations similar to Proposition 1.2 (ii) that $\Phi(W') = \{\, c_i\alpha_s + c_{i\pm1}\alpha_t \mid i \in \mathbb{Z} \,\}$. Hence there are integers m and n such that $x = c_{n\pm1}\alpha_s + c_n\alpha_t$ and $y = c_{m\pm1}\alpha_s + c_m\alpha_t$. Now let us consider the possible values of (x, y):

(a) If $x = c_{n+1}\alpha_s + c_n\alpha_t$ and $y = c_{m+1}\alpha_s + c_m\alpha_t$, then either
$(x, y) = \cosh((n - m)\theta) \ge 1$ if $\theta \ne 0$, or $(x, y) = 1$ if $\theta = 0$.

(b) If $x = c_{n+1}\alpha_s + c_n\alpha_t$ and $y = c_{m-1}\alpha_s + c_m\alpha_t$, then either
$(x, y) = -\cosh((n + m)\theta) \le -1$ if $\theta \ne 0$, or $(x, y) = -1$ if $\theta = 0$.

(c) If $x = c_{n-1}\alpha_s + c_n\alpha_t$ and $y = c_{m+1}\alpha_s + c_m\alpha_t$, then either
$(x, y) = -\cosh((n + m)\theta) \le -1$ if $\theta \ne 0$, or $(x, y) = -1$ if $\theta = 0$.

(d) If $x = c_{n-1}\alpha_s + c_n\alpha_t$ and $y = c_{m-1}\alpha_s + c_m\alpha_t$, then either
$(x, y) = \cosh((n - m)\theta) \ge 1$ if $\theta \ne 0$, or $(x, y) = 1$ if $\theta = 0$.

Since $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$, Lemma 2.2 (iv) yields that we can rule out (b) and (c) above, that is, either

$$\begin{cases} x &= c_{n+1}\alpha_s + c_n\alpha_t \\ y &= c_{m+1}\alpha_s + c_m\alpha_t \end{cases} \quad \text{or else} \quad \begin{cases} x &= c_{n-1}\alpha_s + c_n\alpha_t \\ y &= c_{m-1}\alpha_s + c_m\alpha_t \end{cases}.$$

Next we shall show that $n > m$. Suppose for a contradiction that $m \ge n$. Then either $x = y$ (when $n = m$) or else there will be a $w \in W'$ such that $wx \in \Phi(W') \cap \Phi^-$ and yet $wy \in \Phi(W') \cap \Phi^+$ (when

$n < m$), both contradicting the fact that $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$. Since $c_n > c_m$ whenever $n > m$, it follows that $x - y \in \mathrm{PLC}(\Pi)$. Given the W-invariance of dominance, for any $w \in W$, repeat the above argument with x replaced by wx and y replaced by wy, we may conclude that $w(x-y) \in \mathrm{PLC}(\Pi) \subseteq (P^*)^*$. It then follows from Lemma 3.3 that $x - y \in U^*$. ☐

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose that $x, y \in \Phi$ are distinct with $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$. Then there exists some $w \in W$ such that $wx \in \Phi^+$, $wy \in \Phi^-$ and $(w(x-y), z) \leq 0$ for all $z \in \Phi^+$.*

Proof. Clearly it is enough to show that under such assumptions there exists some $w \in W$ with $wx \in \Phi^+$, $wy \in \Phi^-$ and $(w(x-y), z) \leq 0$ for all $z \in \Pi$.

Let W' be the (infinite) dihedral reflection subgroup of W generated by r_x and r_y, and let $\triangle(W') = \{a_0, b_0\}$. Clearly a_0, $b_0 \in \Phi^+$, and Proposition 3.4 of [11] yields that $(a_0, b_0) = -(x, y) \leq -1$, furthermore, there is some $u \in \langle\{r_x, r_y\}\rangle$ such that either

$$\begin{cases} u(x) &= a_0 \\ u(y) &= -b_0 \end{cases} \qquad \text{or else} \qquad \begin{cases} u(x) &= b_0 \\ u(y) &= -a_0 \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

At any rate, $u(x-y) = a_0 + b_0$. Since the W-action preserves $(\ ,\ )$, it follows that $(a_0, a_0) = 1 = (b_0, b_0)$, and hence $(a_0 + b_0, a_0) \leq 0$ and $(a_0 + b_0, b_0) \leq 0$. However there may exist some $c_1 \in \Pi$ with $(a_0 + b_0, c_1) > 0$. If this is the case, set $a_1 = r_{c_1} a_0$ and $b_1 = r_{c_1} b_0$. Recall that $(d, c_1) \leq 0$ for all $d \in \Pi \setminus \{c_1\}$, so it follows that

$$c_1 \in \operatorname{supp}(a_0) \cup \operatorname{supp}(b_0). \tag{3.3}$$

Since $(a_0 + b_0, c_1) > 0$, whereas $(a_0 + b_0, a_0) \leq 0$ and $(a_0 + b_0, b_0) \leq 0$, it follows that $a_0 \neq c_1$ and $b_0 \neq c_1$. Therefore we see that $a_1, b_1 \in \Phi^+$, and $(a_1, b_1) = (a_0, b_0) \leq -1$. Consequently Theorem 1.8 (ii) yields that a_1, b_1 are the canonical roots for the root subsystem $\Phi(\langle\{r_{a_1}, r_{b_1}\}\rangle)$. Observe that applying r_{c_1} to $a_0 + b_0$ will only decrease the coefficient of c_1, and thus (3.3) yields that

$$\operatorname{supp}(a_1) \cup \operatorname{supp}(b_1) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(a_0) \cup \operatorname{supp}(b_0),$$

and

$$\sum_{a \in \Pi} \operatorname{coeff}_a(a_1) + \sum_{a \in \Pi} \operatorname{coeff}_a(b_1) < \sum_{a \in \Pi} \operatorname{coeff}_a(a_0) + \sum_{a \in \Pi} \operatorname{coeff}_a(b_0).$$

Moreover, since $(a_0 + b_0, c_1) > 0$, it follows that at least one of (a_0, c_1) or (b_0, c_1) must be strictly positive. Hence Lemma 1.7 yields that

$$dp(a_1) + dp(b_1) \leq dp(a_0) + dp(b_0).$$

Repeat this process and we can obtain new pairs of positive roots $\{a_2, b_2\}, \dots, \{a_{m-1}, b_{m-1}\}, \{a_m, b_m\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{supp}(a_m) \cup \operatorname{supp}(b_m) &\subseteq \operatorname{supp}(a_{m-1}) \cup \operatorname{supp}(b_{m-1}) \subseteq \cdots \\ &\subseteq \operatorname{supp}(a_0) \cup \operatorname{supp}(b_0)\end{aligned}$$

and $\operatorname{dp}(a_m) + \operatorname{dp}(b_m) \le \operatorname{dp}(a_{m-1}) + \operatorname{dp}(b_{m-1}) \le \cdots \le \operatorname{dp}(a_0) + \operatorname{dp}(b_0)$, so long as we can find a $c_m \in \Pi$ such that $(a_{m-1} + b_{m-1}, c_m) > 0$. Note that this process only terminates at a pair $\{a_n, b_n\}$ for some n, if $(a_n + b_n, z) \le 0$ for all $z \in \Pi$. Now if we could show that this process terminates at some such $\{a_n, b_n\}$ after a finite number of iterations, then we have in fact found a $w = r_{c_n} r_{c_{n-1}} \cdots r_{c_1} u \in W$ satisfying

$$(w(x-y), z) = (r_{c_n} \cdots r_{c_1}(a_0 + b_0), z) = (a_n + b_n, z) \le 0$$

for all $z \in \Pi$.

Since the set of positive roots having depth less than a specific bound, and support in a fixed finite subset of Π is finite, it then follows that the possible pairs of positive roots $\{a_i, b_i\}$ obtainable in this process must be finite too. Finally since

$$\sum_{a\in\Pi} \operatorname{coeff}_a(a_j) + \sum_{a\in\Pi} \operatorname{coeff}_a(b_j) < \sum_{a\in\Pi} \operatorname{coeff}_a(a_i) + \sum_{a\in\Pi} \operatorname{coeff}_a(b_i)$$

for all $j > i$, it follows that the sequence $\{a_0, b_0\}, \{a_1, b_1\}, \cdots$ must terminate at $\{a_n, b_n\}$ for some finite n, as required.

Furthermore, observe that for all $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$, where n is as above, $r_{c_i} a_{i-1} \in \Phi^+$ and $r_{c_i} b_{i-1} \in \Phi^+$. Therefore it follows immediately that $r_{c_i} \cdots r_{c_1}(a_0) \in \Phi^+$, and $r_{c_i} \cdots r_{c_1}(b_0) \in \Phi^+$, for all $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$. Hence, let $w = r_{c_n} r_{c_{n-1}} \cdots r_{c_1} u \in W$ be as above, (3.2) yields that either

$$\begin{cases} wx &= r_{c_n} \cdots r_{c_1} a_0 \in \Phi^+ \\ wy &= r_{c_n} \cdots r_{c_1}(-b_0) \in \Phi^- \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{cases} wx &= r_{c_n} \cdots r_{c_1} b_0 \in \Phi^+ \\ wy &= r_{c_n} \cdots r_{c_1}(-a_0) \in \Phi^-. \end{cases}$$

□

Definition 3.7. We define the *imaginary cone* Q of W by requiring

$$Q = \{ v \in U^* \mid (v, a) \le 0 \text{ for all but finitely many } a \in \Phi^+ \}.$$

Theorem 3.8. (Dyer, unpublished) *Suppose that x, $y \in \Phi$ are distinct with $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$. Then $x - y \in Q$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.5 we know that $x - y \in U^*$, thus to prove the desired result, we only need to show that $(x - y, z) \le 0$ for all but finitely many $z \in \Phi^+$. Suppose that $z \in \Phi^+$ such that $(x - y, z) > 0$. Let $w \in W$ be as in Proposition 3.6. Then $(w(x - y), wz) > 0$, and by Proposition 3.6 this is possible only if $z \in N(w)$. Since $\#N(w)$ is clearly finite (of size $\ell(w)$), it follows that indeed $(x - y, z) \le 0$ for all but finitely many $z \in \Phi^+$.

□

Corollary 3.9. *Suppose that* x, $y \in \Phi$ *are distinct. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *whenever* $x \operatorname{dom}_W z \operatorname{dom}_W y$ *for some* $z \in \Phi$*, then either* $z = x$ *or* $z = y$*;*
(ii) *there exists a* $w \in W$ *such that* $wx \in D_0$ *and* $wy \in -D_0$*.*

Proof. Suppose that (i) is the case. Let w be as in Proposition 3.6 above. First we show that then $wx \in D_0$. Suppose for a contradiction that $wx \notin D_0$, and let $z \in D(wx)$. Then Proposition 3.6 yields that $wy \in \Phi^-$ and $(wy, z) \geq 1$. Hence it is clear that $z \operatorname{dom}_W wy$. But this implies that $x \operatorname{dom}_W w^{-1}z \operatorname{dom}_W y$ with $x \neq w^{-1}z \neq y$, contradicting (i). Therefore $wx \in D_0$, as required. In a similarly way we may also deduce that $wy \in -D_0$.

Suppose that (ii) is the case and suppose for a contradiction that there exists some $z \in \Phi \setminus \{x, y\}$ such that $x \operatorname{dom}_W z \operatorname{dom}_W y$. Let $w \in W$ with $wx \in D_0$ and $wy \in -D_0$. If $wz \in \Phi^+$ then Lemma 2.2 (ii) yields that $wx \operatorname{dom}_W wz$, contradicting the fact that $wx \in D_0$. On the other hand, if $wz \in \Phi^-$, then Lemma 2.2 (ii) and (iii) yield that $-wy \operatorname{dom}_W -wz \in \Phi^+$, contradicting the fact that $-wy \in D_0$.

□

Observe that applying Corollary 3.9 to arbitrary reflection subgroup W' of W yields the following:

Corollary 3.10. *Suppose that* W' *is a reflection subgroup of* W *with* x *and* $y \in \Phi(W')$ *being distinct. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *whenever* $x \operatorname{dom}_{W'} z \operatorname{dom}_{W'} y$ *for some* $z \in \Phi(W')$*, then either* $z = x$ *or* $z = y$*;*
(ii) *there exists a* $w \in W'$ *such that* $wx \in D_{W',0}$ *and* $wy \in -D_{W',0}$*.*

□

Definition 3.11. Suppose that W' is a reflection subgroup of W and $x, y \in \Phi(W')$ satisfy both (i) and (ii) of Corollary 3.10. Then we say that the dominance between x and y is *minimal* with respect to W'.

Proposition 3.12. *Suppose that* $x, y \in \Phi$ *are distinct with* $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$*. Then the dominance between* x *and* y *with respect to the dihedral reflection subgroup* $\langle\{r_x, r_y\}\rangle$ *is minimal.*

Proof. Let $W' = \langle\{r_x, r_y\}\rangle$. The fact $x \operatorname{dom}_W y$ implies that $(x, y) \geq 1$. Let a and b be the canonical roots for $\Phi(W')$. Then Proposition 3.4 of [11] yields that $(a, b) = -(x, y) \leq -1$ and hence $a \operatorname{dom}_W -b$ and $b \operatorname{dom}_W -a$. Again, we know that there are two dominance chains in the root subsystem $\Phi(W')$ as follows:

$$\cdots \operatorname{dom}_{W'} r_a r_b r_a(b) \operatorname{dom}_{W'} r_a r_b(a) \operatorname{dom}_{W'} r_a(b) \operatorname{dom}_{W'} a \operatorname{dom}_{W'} (-b) \operatorname{dom}_{W'} r_b(-a) \operatorname{dom}_{W'} r_b r_a(-b) \operatorname{dom}_{W'} \cdots \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ r_b r_a r_b(a)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ r_b r_a(b)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ r_b(a)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ b \\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}(-a)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ r_a(-b)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ r_a r_b(-a)\ \operatorname{dom}_{W'}\ \cdots . \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

From (3.4) and (3.5), we can immediately deduce that $D_{W',0} = \{a, b\}$. On the other hand, it follows from Proposition 3.4 of [11] that there is some $w \in W'$ such that either

$$\begin{cases} wx &= a \\ wy &= -b \end{cases} \quad \text{or else} \quad \begin{cases} wx &= b \\ wy &= -a, \end{cases}$$

consequently Corollary 3.10 yields that the dominance between x and y with respect to $\langle\{r_x, r_y\}\rangle$ is minimal. □

From the above proposition we may deduce:

Lemma 3.13. *Suppose that* $x \in \Phi^+$ *with* $D(x) = \{x_1, x_2. \dots, x_m\}$*. For each* $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$*, set* $W_i = \langle\{r_x, r_{x_i}\}\rangle$*. Then* $W_i \neq W_j$ *whenever* $i \neq j$*.*

Proof. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, set $\{s_i, t_i\} = S(W_i)$. Suppose for a contradiction that $W' = W_i = W_j$ for some $i \neq j$. Then we may write $\{s, t\} = \{s_i, t_i\} = \{s_j, t_j\}$. Corollary 2.3 (ii) yields that $x \operatorname{dom}_{W_k} x_k$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, and since there is no non-trivial dominance in finite Coxeter groups, it follows that $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_m$ are all infinite dihedral reflection subgroups. Hence it follows from Proposition 4.5.4 of [1] that $(\alpha_s, \alpha_t) \leq -1$. Set $\theta = \cosh^{-1}(-(\alpha_s, \beta_t))$, and for each integer n, write $c_n = \frac{\sinh(n\theta)}{\sinh\theta}$ if $\theta \neq 0$, and write $c_n = n$ if $\theta = 0$. Since $x \operatorname{dom}_W x_i$ and $x \operatorname{dom}_W x_j$, similar arguments as in the proof of Proposition 3.5 yield

$$\begin{cases} x &= c_m\alpha_s + c_{m+1}\alpha_t \\ x_i &= c_{m'}\alpha_s + c_{m'+1}\alpha_t \\ x_j &= c_{m''}\alpha_s + c_{m''+1}\alpha_t \end{cases} \quad \text{or else} \quad \begin{cases} x &= c_m\alpha_s + c_{m-1}\alpha_t \\ x_i &= c_{m'}\alpha_s + c_{m'-1}\alpha_t \\ x_j &= c_{m''}\alpha_s + c_{m''-1}\alpha_t \end{cases}$$

for some distinct integers m, m' and m''. Observe that in either case, either $(x_i, x_j) = \cosh((m' - m'')\theta) \geq 1$ (if $\theta \neq 0$), or else $(c_i, x_j) = 1$ (if $\theta = 0$), and therefore there will be (non-trivial) dominance between x_i and x_j. Without loss of any generality, we may assume that $x \operatorname{dom}_W x_i \operatorname{dom}_W x_j$. Then $x \operatorname{dom}_{W'} x_i \operatorname{dom}_{W'} x_j$ by Corollary 2.3 (ii), contradicting Proposition 3.12. □

We close this paper with an alternative characterization for the imaginary cone Q when $\#\Pi < \infty$.

Proposition 3.14. *If* $\#\Pi < \infty$ *then*

$$Q = \{\, wv \mid w \in W \text{ and } v \in P \text{ such that } (v, a) \leq 0 \text{ for all } a \in \Phi^+ \,\}.$$

Proof. First set

$$X = \{\, wv \mid w \in W \text{ and } v \in P \text{ such that } (v, a) \leq 0 \text{ for all } a \in \Phi^+ \,\}.$$

Let $u \in Q$ be arbitrary. Since $\#\Pi < \infty$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that $u \in P$. For each $b \in P$, define $\operatorname{Pos}(b) = \{\, c \in \Phi^+ \mid (b, c) > 0 \,\}$. If $\operatorname{Pos}(u) = \emptyset$, then trivially $u \in X$. Therefore we may assume that $\operatorname{Pos}(u) \neq \emptyset$, and proceed by an induction on $\# \operatorname{Pos}(u)$. Let $a \in \Pi$ be chosen such that $(u, a) > 0$. Then it can be readily checked that $\operatorname{Pos}(r_a u) = r_a(\operatorname{Pos}(u) \setminus \{a\})$. Thus the inductive hypothesis yields that $r_a u \in X$. Clearly X is W-invariant, and so $u \in X$. Since $u \in Q$ was arbitrary, it follows that $Q \subseteq X$.

Conversely, if $x \in X$, then $x = wv$ for some $w \in W$ and $v \in P$ such that $(v, a) \leq 0$ for all $a \in \Pi$. Lemma 3.4 yields that $v \in U^*$, and since U^* is clearly W-invariant, it follows that $x \in U^*$. Suppose that $y \in \Phi^+$ with $(x, y) > 0$. Since $(x, y) = (wv, y) = (v, w^{-1}y)$, it follows that $y \in N(w^{-1})$. The finiteness of the set $N(w^{-1})$ then implies that $x \in Q$. Since $x \in X$ was arbitrary, it follows that $X \subseteq Q$. □

4. Acknowledgments

A few results presented in this paper are taken from the author's PhD thesis [10] and the author wishes to thank A/Prof. R. B. Howlett for all his help and encouragement throughout the author's PhD candidature. The author also wishes to thank Prof. G. I. Lehrer and Prof. R. Zhang for supporting this work.

References

1. A. Björner and F. Brenti, *Combinatorics of Coxeter Groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, GTM 231, Springer, 2005
2. N. Bourbaki, *Groupes et algebras de Lie, Chapitres 4, 5 et 6* , Hermann, Paris, 1968
3. B. Brink and R. B. Howlett, *A finiteness property and an automatic structure of Coxeter groups*, Math. Ann. **296** (1993), 179–190.
4. B. Brink, *The set of dominance-minimal roots*, J. Algebra **206** (1998), 371–412.
5. V. Deodhar, *On the root system of a Coxeter group*, Comm. Algebra, 10(6): 611–630, 1982.
6. M. Dyer, *Hecke algebras and reflections in Coxeter groups*, PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 1987.
7. M. Dyer, *Reflection Subgroups of Coxeter Systems*, J. Algebra **135** (1990), 57–73.
8. M. Dyer, *On the "Bruhat graph" of a Coxeter system*, Compositio Math. 78 (1991), no. 2, 185–191.
9. T. Edgar, *Dominance and regularity in Coxeter groups*, PhD thesis, University of Notre Dame, 2009 (downloadable from http://etd.nd.edu/ETD-db/).
10. X. Fu, *Root systems and reflection representations of Coxeter groups*, PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 2010.
11. X. Fu, *The Dominance Hierarchy of Root Systems of Coxeter Groups*, submitted, 2011 (downloadable from http://arxiv.org/abs/1108.2940).
12. J.-Y. Hée, *Le cône imaginaire d'une base de racines sur* $\mathbb{R}$, unpublished.

13. J.-Y. Hée, *Sur la torsion de Steinberg-Ree des groupes de Chevalley et des groupes de Kac-Moody*, PhD thesis, Université de Paris-Sud, Orsay, 1993.
14. H. Hiller, *Geometry of Coxeter Groups.* Research Notes in Mathematics 54, Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston-London, 1981.
15. R. B. Howlett, *Normalizers of parabolic subgroups of reflection groups*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 21 (1980), no. 1, 62–80.
16. R. B. Howlett, *Introduction to Coxeter groups*, Lectures given at ANU, 1996 (available at http://www.maths.usyd.edu.au/res/Algebra/How/1997-6.html).
17. R. B. Howlett, P. J. Rowley and D. E. Taylor, *On outer automorphisms of Coxeter groups*, Manuscripta Math. 94 (1997), 499–513.
18. J. Humphreys, *Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups*, Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics 29, 1990.
19. V. G. Kac, *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, third edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
20. D. Krammer, *The conjugacy problem for Coxeter groups*, PhD thesis, Universiteit Utrecht, 1994.